

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 13, 2002 LB 435

dialogue with Senator Chambers, when he asked some equal protection questions about LB 435 on Select File. I'm pleased to be able to establish a little bit of legislative record on that issue. The Nebraska Constitution, Article I, Section 3, provides the following: "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor be denied equal protection of the laws." Although this language is a relatively recent addition to the Nebraska Constitution, it's the same language as in Article XIV of the United States Constitution. Additionally, the special legislation prohibition of the State Constitution has been interpreted as serving essentially the same function as the equal protection provision of the U.S. Constitution, so there is considerable case law applying the equal protection test to state legislation. The equal protection clause in the Nebraska Constitution prohibits the Legislature from creating arbitrary classifications and then discriminating against the classes in the application of regulations or the denial of benefits unless there is a valid compelling public interest served in doing that. So the question is whether we have established legitimate state interests and that there is a rational relationship between that interest and the statutory mechanisms of the bill. There's a number of things that tend to give me confidence that the bill would withstand that challenge. First of all, LB 435 is a successor to LB 1432, which I introduced two sessions ago and which was examined in an AG Opinion requested by former State Senator John Hilgert. That opinion was printed in the first day's Journal last session. The Attorney General found that the legislation would withstand an equal protection challenge as well as other types of constitutional challenges, including impairment of contracts, takings, and commerce clause. I should like to point out that this bill does not attempt to shield agricultural tenants from market forces. It simply provides a means for agricultural tenants to ask for a third party review to determine the fair market rate of the lease or property value in order that ag tenants, who are inherently vulnerable due to their investments and need access to rail services, to avoid being taken advantage of. I'd also like to mention that a similar statute in Iowa was upheld in a 1991 case before the Iowa Supreme Court. Similar to LB 435, the Iowa law provided that tenants upon railroad property may, when negotiation